

Remarks

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended this claim to provide antecedent basis for the communication link by identifying it as the exterior communications link. It is submitted that this amendment overcomes the objection and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charrin (US Publication No. 2003/0014370).

The office action states that 'Charrin discloses the capability of transferring data between the components,' and 'it would have been obvious to...allow communication between the controllers of Charrin on a peer-to-peer basis.'

With regard to the first part, the data is not being transferred between the components on a peer-to-peer basis. As defined in the specification, a peer-to-peer fashion is where the controllers communicate with each other without a host or master controller. The transfer of data between the two components disclosed in Charrin is not peer-to-peer communications. The main idea behind the connection of the card reader and the bill acceptor is that the bill acceptor communicates with the hose interface by passing its data lines through the card reader. There is no interaction between the card reader controller and the bill acceptor controller.

With regard to the second point, it would not have been obvious to use peer-to-peer communications, as the entire focus of the disclosure in Charrin is to allow the bill acceptor to be attached in such a way as to allow the data to pass through the card reader. See Charrin, paragraphs 0032, the last two sentences, paragraph 0042, last two sentences. The controllers of these devices do not interact, the data merely passed through one interface on the card reader out another interface on the card reader.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out this difference. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-6 and 8-10 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charrin in view of Gordon et al (US 2003/0064806).

As will be discussed in more detail with regard to claims 11-16, Gordon discloses a gaming machine in which the components are connected to a serial bus or a serial network, with a CPU as the arbiter of the bus. See paragraphs 0032 and 0034. The connection is described as a serial bus connection, which requires a bus arbiter or controller. There is no communications in Gordon that are peer-to-peer, much less an exterior communication link that is peer-to-peer as well as the interior communications link. It is therefore submitted that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon. Gordon discloses a gaming machine in which the individual components are connected in a serial bus or serial network. This type of connection requires a CPU or other controller to provide bus arbitration. See paragraph 0032, second sentence. With regard to the devices being shown directly connected, they are actually connected together in a daisy-chain serial bus, again, which requires a bus controller. See paragraph 0034, the text at the top of the second column on page 3.

Nowhere is Gordon is there any suggestion of any kind that the controllers of the components communicate in a peer-to-peer fashion. The failure to even suggest that it would be desirable fails to meet the standards required for a prima facie case of obviousness. 35 USC 103. Further, the communication between the outside world and the gaming components in the machine are through the CPU. See paragraph 0043. The descriptions of Figs. 4a-4c are various embodiments of serial bus network topologies. The devices are not actually connected together as those connections have been interpreted in the office action. See paragraph 0037. Therefore, Gordon does not teach, show or suggest an interior communications link with peer-to-peer communications, nor an exterior communications link with peer-to-peer communications. There is no motivation in Gordon to do so, as the focus is on providing a serial bus interface to the gaming components.

Claim 11 has been amended to more clearly point out that the controllers of the various devices need to communicate in a peer-to-peer fashion. It is therefore submitted that claims 11 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the


limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 12-16 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.


Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613